9

10

1 [illegible] 16.10.74 [illegible]

1 [illegible]

1 [illegible] 23.2.92 [illegible]

1 [illegible]

1 [illegible] 20.6.91 [illegible]

1 [illegible] 11.2.93 [illegible] 1506 [illegible]

1 [illegible] 16.9.92 [illegible] 17 [illegible]

1 [illegible] 23.2.92 [illegible]

1 [illegible] 12.11.84 [illegible] 2030 [illegible]

17/9/93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(5)

C.R. 164 92-4

The accompanying Petitions Nos 1506 & 3164 dated 15/12/92 & 10/3/93 received at the Dewan's Office from Desakulakarani Venkatakrishnaiya of Narasapura Malur Taluk, appealing against the ~~Revenue Settlement decision~~ ~~Kolar 8/6.9.92~~ regarding Petitioner's complaint that certain lands of his Kayamenitta village Chinnahalli were ~~encroached~~ surveyed into the neighbouring village of Pakanahalli is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the ~~Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District~~ Superintendent Mysore Revenue Survey for submission of proceedings with a report on the facts of the case and on the points taken in the petitions.

The petitions with the enclosures should be returned.

By Order,

Draft (Councillor's order)

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 189 .

Ref 425-26

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore & Kolar with a request that the records of any enquiry held on Petitioner's complaint, in the Revenue Office may be forwarded to this Office.

By Order

Chief Secretary.

M. G. O. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

No. 47.

1893. 4404

25 SEP

Pet 205

From The Supdt Mysore Rev Survey

(6)

To The Chief Secretary to the
~~The Revenue Survey,~~
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated } Channapatna
Despatched } 22nd September 1893

Received

Enclosures No. with 2 fcbs

General No. 209 } 1893.
No.

Chief Secretary's Official
Memorandum No. Pet of
424
the 11th Instant
16

In returning the Petitions with the enclosures received with the above, I have the honor to forward, as desired the accompanying Proceedings connected with the Boundary Dispute between Kaimgutta village of Kola

Kolar Chinnahalli in the Hoskote Taluk and the Government village of Sikarsanhalli in the Kolar Taluk and to request that the same may kindly be returned when done with.

Supt. Mysore Rev. Survey

Peth Sr.

How did this mistake arise? MNRao 5/9

Await reply from Kolar - send reminder if not rec'd within a week, MNRao 7/9

LR 164-92-6

(General Serial No. 30.)

4224.

25 SEP 9

1893-94 Pet 208

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore District

(7)

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 23rd September 1893.

Despatched 25th Do

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

D No. 410

The Chief Secretary's docket No. 425-6 dated 11th Instant, regarding the complaint of Desakula - Karni Venkata Krishnah of Narsapur, Malur Taluk, about certain lands of his Rayangutta village having been surveyed into the Government village of Chakarasanahully.

Begs to state that as Malur Taluk belongs to the Kolar District, the

above has been transferred
to the Dy Commissioner
of that District.

H Hannah Reo

For Dy Commissioner

Wes

To Present

(8)

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements,
Bangalore.

LR 164-92-7

No. 22522 / P.2054. dated 18th June 1894.
23.

Has the honor to request that the Inam Supdt will be so good as to forward, at an early date, the Inam Registers of Kolar Chinnahalli Kayangatta village in the Hoskote Taluk, for reference.

By Order

Draft (Council order)

22/6/94

for Chief Secretary

22/6

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.
No.

References to be marked.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—21-12-92.—2000.

District

Review and Confirmation by the Superintendent of Inam Settlements

14

7. Revised as per the Government Proceedings No. 4,701-9/133 of 2nd September 1881.

8. Vide the statement received with Survey Superintendent's docket No. 395/11 of 11th August 1886

A - G. R. A. P.

Total area assessment - 90-28-2-12-0

Deduct for a Minor Inam - 1-26-0-4-0

Balance 89-2-2-8-0 which is unculturable. —

9. Finally confirmed on the existing gutta of Rupees 13-0-0. —

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Supt. of Inam Settlts.
16-5-89.

"Copy"
J. P. Grant
Supt. of Inam Settlts.

Compd
by

Copy of the Register Form of the Kayamgutta Kolalchinnale

No. of case.	General class to which the Kayamgutta village belongs.	Beriz of the village.	Description of Inam. If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for buildings, &c., whether they are effectively kept up.	Amount of Kayamgutta paid to Government.	By whom granted and in what year.
2		3	4	5	6
(J.D No 20)					
19.	Personal	Kadim Beriz P.F.V. 9-1-4 = R 4 0 26-7-7	For Personal benefit	P.F.V 4-5-4 = R-4-0 13-1-6	His Highness the late Imaha-rajah Khana 1831-32

Note

The Survey valuation of the village gives to each fanam of the old beriz Rs: 0-0-6 which is adopted in valuing Minor Inam.

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Supdt of Inam Settlt

16-5-89

(-9-a)

alli — village of ——— in the Sullale —

Written instruments in support of the claim, original sanad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, &c, and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.	Name of the original grantee.	Whether the village is entered in the Register of Kayamgutta Villages received from the Chief Commissioner's Office; if not, in what other accounts.
7	8	9

For Sanad vide Column 7 of the Register No 3 on Sodda-Togali

Venkat Row

Huzur Kayamgutta account of 1835

V. No 332

Srinivas Row Son of party in Column 8.

Kadasm Berij

Pa. 7-6

9-1-0

Gutta Amount

Pa. 7. 6.

4-5-0

Taluk Return 1878.

Present Holder Soobunnah widow of Hanmanta Row

Rs: 13-1-6

Sammat / Hasthole

Residence, name, age, &c., of the present owner.	Relation to original grantee.	If unconnected with the original holder, possession how obtained and in what year.
10	11	12
1. Soobammah	widow of Grand nephew.	By descent.
2. Srinivas Rao	Great Grand Nephew by adoption.	1900

Taluk . —— Bangalore

Assistant's opinion and recommendation.

13

1. Notice served on Subammah on 2nd September 1878.
(Initialled) R. a C

2. Subammah has this day appeared & states that this Village also fell to her father-in-law's share, vide remarks in Column 13 of the Register No. 15 for Gadda = Chinnenhalli of this Taluk. Case adjourned to 1st Proximo for production of the Deed of Division

Hoskote
13th Septr 1878

(Signed) Robt Cole.
Supdt of Inam Settlt.

3. Vide orders on Register of Gadda Chinnenhalli, No. 15 of this book. For the same reasons this Village is entered in the names of both Soobammah and Srinivas Rao.

4. Confirmed on the existing Gutta, or Rs: Thirteen, subject to all Local Fund & Irrigation Cesses.

5. All rights to Sayer, Abkari & Forests are reserved.

6. A Valuation Survey is desired.

Bangalore
8th January 1879

(Signed) Robt Cole
Supdt of Inam Settlt.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರಿಗೆ ಸಲಾಮು ಪೂರ್ವಕ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲವು ಜನ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೋಮಾರಿತನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು

٦٠١١٤٢١٠	٥٨٣٠	٥
عطيل	مدفوع	الرصيد

الموظف ـــــــــــ

التاريخ ١٤٢٦/٩/١٠

توقيع المدير المالي ـــــــــــ

توقيع أمين الصندوق ـــــــــــ

التاريخ ١٤٢٦/٩/١٠

توقيع المدير المالي ـــــــــــ

توقيع أمين الصندوق ـــــــــــ

٦٠١١٤٢١٠	٥٨٣٠	٥
عطيل	مدفوع	الرصيد

الموظف ـــــــــــ

التاريخ ١٤٢٦/٩/١٠

توقيع المدير المالي ـــــــــــ

توقيع أمين الصندوق ـــــــــــ

۲۶- ۷ -۵

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

۹ ۱۲ ۹۲

[illegible]

۱۵ ۱۲ ۹۲

[illegible]

۱۲ ۱۲ ۹۲

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ناجائز تعمیرات کیخلاف کارروائی نہ کرنے پر ڈسٹرکٹ آفیسر ۱۹۱۱۱۰۱۰

ڈسٹرکٹ آفیسر ۔۔۔

طلاق بائن دینے کا حکم

حسب ذیل مقدمات میں ۵۵۰ روپے ماہوار سے ۳۳۰ روپے ماہوار تک
ماہوار خاوند کے خلاف نان و نفقہ کی ڈگریاں ہوئیں

مقدمہ ۱ — مدعیہ نے خاوند — مدعا علیہ پر دعویٰ کیا کہ مدعا علیہ
کے پاس کافی سامان و جائیداد موجود ہے اور مدعیہ کی نان و نفقہ
طلاق بائن دینے کا حکم

حسب کیس مدعیہ کی ماہوار آمدنی ۲۵۰ روپے کی تھی اور
مدعا علیہ کی ۱۲۵۰ روپے ماہوار

مقدمہ ۲ — مدعیہ نے خاوند — مدعا علیہ پر دعویٰ کیا کہ مدعا علیہ
کے پاس کافی سامان و جائیداد موجود ہے اور مدعیہ کی نان و نفقہ
طلاق بائن دینے کا حکم

حسب کیس مدعیہ کی ماہوار آمدنی ۲۵۰ روپے کی تھی اور
مدعا علیہ کی ۱۲۵۰ روپے ماہوار

مقدمہ ۳ — مدعیہ نے خاوند — مدعا علیہ پر دعویٰ کیا کہ مدعا علیہ
کے پاس کافی سامان و جائیداد موجود ہے اور مدعیہ کی نان و نفقہ
طلاق بائن دینے کا حکم

حسب کیس مدعیہ کی ماہوار آمدنی ۲۵۰ روپے کی تھی اور
مدعا علیہ کی ۱۲۵۰ روپے ماہوار

مقدمہ ۴ — مدعیہ نے خاوند — مدعا علیہ پر دعویٰ کیا کہ مدعا علیہ
کے پاس کافی سامان و جائیداد موجود ہے اور مدعیہ کی نان و نفقہ
طلاق بائن دینے کا حکم

حسب کیس مدعیہ کی ماہوار آمدنی ۲۵۰ روپے کی تھی اور
مدعا علیہ کی ۱۲۵۰ روپے ماہوار

5-7-96

No. 1506-3164-
LR 164-92-9

24-7-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

18th July 1894 (11)

Endorsement granted to Venkatakrishnia of Narsapur, Malur Taluk

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1506+3164 dated 15th Dec. 1892 and 10th March 93 appealing against the Survey Superintendent's decision regarding petitioner's complaint that certain land of his Hanyamenta Kolal village and Measurement about 135 acres was wrongly added on to the village Chimahalli were erroneously the neighbouring Govt village of Chakarambatti at the last Survey.

Petitioner is informed that his appeal has been dismissed as he failed to make out a case that the land in dispute belongs to his village, while on the other hand, there is evidence that the land has been long in the enjoyment of Sircar villages

2 The enc: are returned

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Redraft

M. G. C. P, Bangalore—6-3-94,—2000.

LR 164-92-10

Before the Government of ~~His Highness~~ the Maharaja of Mysore.

(12)

Petition

Appeal No. 3164 of 1893-94

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Venkatakrishniah
Kayamgottadar of
Kolal Chinnahalli, Hoskote
taluk

Decision. 9th July 1894

Petitioner is the present Kayamgottadar of Kolal Chinnahalli Hoskote Taluk. The boundary dispute of this village was settled in May 1884 by the Survey Department and the former holder of the village presented a petition to the Deputy Commissioner in December 1884 protesting against the Settlement, and the Deputy Commissioner instead of rejecting the petition as one beyond his province to settle, admitted it ordered a local enq[illegible]

A local enquiry was held and no definite conclusion was arrived at, and the Deputy Commissioner finally rejected appellant's claim in September 1892 on the ground that he had no power to enquire into the matter. Petitioner then appealed to Government and they admitted the appeal on the ground that appellant was misled by the action of the Deputy Commissioner and was not responsible for the delay in preferring his appeal to Government against the decision of the Settlement Department.

2. Now, coming to the merits of the case, appellant relies on two documents— viz (1) account of Krishna 1865-66 of the village, and (2) the account of Siddhanti 1859-60 for the Sircar village of Chalkunnarsanhalli. Both these accounts were before the Survey Deptt when

when the dispute was
settled, & through the account
of Krodhana then produced
? X was an ~~un~~ authenticated
copy, the Survey Depart.
ment took the entries
contained in those accounts
into consideration, and
rejected appellant's claim
on the ground that there
was abundant evidence
that the land claimed by
the petitioners did not
belong to his village
Even the subsequent enquiry
held by the Amildar shows
that the land disputed
? (about 138 acres) has not
been in the possession of the
Kayamgnttadars for
upwards of 30 years and
the accounts produced
do not show conclusively
that the land belongs to
petitioners

3. Under these circum-
stances, Government
consider that appellant

has not made out a
case to establish ——
his claim and his appeal
is therefore finally rejected

By Order

Redraft

Chief Secretary

No 1346. dy 18-7-94
P.T. 13-94 25

Copy to the Supt of Revenue
Survey returning the
Original records received
with his no. 209 dated
22 Sept 1893.

Chief Secy.

Corrected order

SHA 1877

1877

28/12/1

Under Secretary
attention

Ref Dept for report if any ground exist for review.

12/10/95 (Sd) K.S.

Ref'd by 16-9-2-11

Refs at once

(Sd) C.S.

13-10-95

1895 (13)

C No. 112/1421

Name of Petitioner, D. Venkatakrishnaiya

Village, Narasapur

Taluk, Malur

District, Kolar

Date of Arzi, 24-6-95

Date of Receipt, 16-10-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 12.

If No be properly arranged & indexed—
16/10

Subd to the Rev Secy.
The records have been returned to the Survey Supte.
The facts appear from the Decision of Govt & the Reports in the file, but it may be necessary to refer to the map showing the ~~dist~~ boundaries in dispute which has gone back with the records.
Call for the Record
23/10 by 11/11

Re submitted with the records—
16/11

Subd 4/12

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the decision of Govt as set forth in the office Endt No 15-06/3164 dy 24/5/94, regarding certain lands belonging to the Kanjangutta ~ing to the Kolar Chinnahally, alleged to have been annexed to the Govt village Chakarsanahally during the Survey Settlement.

States that the lands were fraudulently included in the the village lands of Chakarsanhally, by the Inojinidar during the Survey Settlement; and

and upon his appeal to the Durbar
the case was posted to the Council for hearing where
he was heard by the members who
were unacquainted with ~~the~~ Canarese and consequently
~~who~~ passed over his reasonable statements

Prays that the lands taken away from the Inam village
may be restored to him

CR 112
14-10-95
1421
16/10

56

Rec'd 16-10-95
Sd/- Illegible
Illegible

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
DATE 16-10-95

(11) 24-7-94 1506/3164

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10) 16-8-92 2252

(11)

24-6-95

(124)

LR: 164-92-92

To

The Superintendent
of the Revenue Survey
in Mysore

No. 4441 / P.T.13-94 dt 7.11.95

Rec. dil.

Has the honor to request that the entire records relating to the appeal of Venkat Krishnaiya, Kaigam Sultadar of Kolal Chinnahalli Hoskote Taluk, returned with this office No 1346/P.T.13-94 dated 18th July 1894, may be forwarded to this office at an early date, for reference in connection with an appn for review presented by the said Venkat Krishnaiya

By order

7/11/95

Revenue Secretary

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 3845
No.
1895 3 NOV. 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

KR Vol 92-13

Before
12/11/95

From

The Superintendent,

Mysore Revenue Survey.

To

The Revenue Secretary to
the Govt of Mysore

Dated

Despatched Bangalore 12th
November/95

Received

General No. 664
No.

Enclosure No. One file of corres.
1
Revenue Secretary's docket

No 4441/P.4113-94 of the 7/11th Instant.

With reference to the
above has the honor to forward
herewith the entire correspondence X
received under Chief Secretary's
X from No 1 to 73

No 1346/P.4113-94 dated 18th July 1894

as described in the above.

Asst Supt. Mysore Revenue
survey

(15)

Draft Printing

C.R. 164-92-14

To

The Supdt of Land Records in Mysore

Re 7701 / F.8/13-94 dt 15/2/18 (1029)

In docket No 664 dt 12/11/25 forwarding the correspondence relating to the boundary dispute between Kayampalla Kolat chinnahalli of Hunsur taluk & the 8 Nos. village of Chikkanahalli of the Kolar taluk

Has the honour to request that copies of the Drawal Register No 3 of Doddabetta-Jogahalli & Drawal Register No 15 of Gaddahunsenahalli — which are referred to in the Drawal Regr of Kolar Division

May be forwarded for reference

Bycroft

14/2/95

6221
Pet 460

189 (16)

From

The Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

General and Revenue Department

Dated 25th
Despatched 26th February 98.
Received

No. 69. of 1897-98

LR 164-92-15

Enclosure No. Two.

As requested in his docket —
No. 7701 dated 15th instant,
Ref. Jno 13-94
has the honor to forward, herewith,
Copies of the Inam Settlement —
Registers of Dodda Thaggali
and Gaddachinnenahalli —
Kayenguttla villages, in the
Hosakote Taluk.

Supdt of Inam Settlt

Petition
25/2/98

Rd 1/3.
Dft 13-2-98 on the subject is put up
AK
1/3/98
2/3/98

(Register Book No. 648
Village Doddatagali
Sammath Wagata
Taluk = Hosakote.

Register Form of the Kayamgutta

No. of case.	General class to which the Kayamgutta village belongs.	Beriz of the village,	Description of Inam. If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for buildings, &c., whether they are efficiently kept up.	Amount of Kayamgutta paid to Government.	By whom granted and in what year.
	2	3	4	5	6
Title deed No 19 15	Personal	Kadim Beriz P. F. V 3-0-0 Rs-as-p 8-11-8	For personal benefit	P-F-V 2-1-0 Rs-as-p 6-1-9	His Highness the late Maharajah Khara. 1831-32
					Revised Final Title deed No 728.
					Title deed No 305 Date of preparation 1-10-78 Date of issue to Taluk

village of Doddatagali in the Wagatta

Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, &c, and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.	Name of the original grantee.	Whether the village is entered in the Register of Kayamgutta Villages received from the Chief Commissioner's Office; if not, in what other accounts.
7	8	9
For Sunnad vide column 7 of the Register No 3 for Wodda-Tagali.	Venkat Row	Huzur Kayam gutta account of 1835. V No 328 Srinivas Row Son of party in Column 8 Kadim Beriz P. H. V 3 — " — " Gutta Amount P. H. V 2 — 1 — " Examined (Initialled) Robert Cole Supt of Inam Setts Taluk Register 78 Present Holder Soobunnah, wife of Hanmanta Row Rs 6—1—9.
Note The Survey valuation of the village given is to each fanam of the old beriz Rs 0—1—9 which is adopted in valuing minor Inams. 16-5-89 (Signed) J. P. Grant Superintendent of Inam Settlements		

Summut

Residence, name, age, &c., of the present owner.	Relation to original grantee.	If unconnected with the original holder, possession how obtained and in what year.
10	11	12
1 Lodaummah	Widow of grand Nephew.	By descendant
2 Triniwas Row	Great grand Nephew by adoption.	W. o ——.

Hoskote Taluk Bangalore

Assistant's opinion and recommendation.

13

1 Notice served on Soobammah on 13th September 78
dated 11-9-78. (Initialled) Robert Cole.
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements

2 Soobammah has appeared this day and states that this village fell on division (Vide remarks of this date in Column 13 of Register 19 for Mylsandra in Devanhalli Taluk) to the share of her late husbands father, Ramapah.

3 Read petition of 10th instant from Sriniwas Row claiming a share in this village. He is absent and by the Taluk return and by Soobammah's statement he has no enjoyment. His claim is therefore merely noted here.

4 Adjourned to 7 proximo.

Hoskote
13th September 78 } (Signed) Robert Cole.
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements

5 As Soobammah has failed to produce the deed of division this village is confirmed in the names of Soobammah and Sriniwas Row leaving the latter if not in possession, to proceed to the civil courts.

6 Confirmed on the existing gutta; or Rs 6 subject to all Local Fund and Irrigation Cesses.

7 All rights to Sayer, Abkari and Forests are reserved.

District

8 A valuation Survey is desired.

Bangalore
7th January 1879 }

(Signed) Robert Cole.
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements.

9 Revised as per the Government Proceedings No. 470 - 9 / 133 dated 2nd September 81 ——

10 Vide the Statement received with Survey Superintendents Docket No. 395 / 11 dated 11th August 1886. ——

	A — G	Rs — as — P
Total area and assessment	120 — 34	3 — 42 — 0
We deduct for a minor Inam	1 — 0	0 — 8 — 0
Balance	119 — 34	3 — 4 — 0

which is unculturable ——

11 Finally confirmed on the existing gutta of Rs 6-0-

Dated 16-5-89

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements

12 This village is not subject to revision under the Government Proceedings No. 14223-5 / P. R. 100-93 Dated 17th February 1894 Vide Survey Superintendents yadi No. 663 Dated 3rd October 1896

Dated 8-11-97

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

Compd
E

Dated 25th February 98

Copy

Supt. of Inam Settlt.

Register no 648.

Village Gabbachimmanahalli also called
Gattadahosahally.

Summuth = Sulibele as per account of 1836

Talnk — Hosakote.

Register Form of the Kayamgutta

No. of case.	General class to which the Kayamgutta village belongs.	Beriz of the village.	Description of Inam. If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for buildings, &c., whether they are efficiently kept up.	Amount of Kayamgutta paid to Government.	By whom granted and in what year.
	2	3	4	5	6
Title Deed No. 2 3	Personal	Kadim Beriz P. F. V 202-9-2 Rs-as-p 590-4-8	For personal benefit Revised Final Title Deed No. 716 2nd Revised Final Title Deed No. 485 Title Deed No. 292 Date of preparation 10-78 Date of issue to Taluk	P. F. V 63-8-0 = Rs. as. p 185-9-7	His Highness the late Maharajah. Khara 1831-32.

Note

The Survey valuation of the village gives to each Inam of the old beriz Rs. 0-2-8 which is adopted in valuing Minor Inams.

13-5-89

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

village of Gadachinnenahalli also called Gaddadahosahalli as per account of 1835 in the —— Sulibele

Written instruments in support of the claim, original sanad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, &c, and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.	Name of the original grantee.	Whether the village is entered in the Register of Kayamgutta Villages received from the Chief Commissioner's Office; if not, in what other accounts.
7	8	9
1 Authenticated copy from Division Commissioner's office (Vide his Docket No. "307 of 78) of the 5th September Maharajah's Nirroop of 11th Oct 1831 to the Amil of Hoskote directing the villages of.—	Jangumkote Wes Kalkarani Venkat Row	Huzur Kayam gutta account of 1835. V. Rs 3/4
1 Waddatagali.		Srinivas Row Son of party in column 8
2 Hosskur.		Kadim Beriz
3 Krishnamana-hosahalli		P. Fl. V
4 Guddada Chinhalli.		202 - 9 - 2
5 Jeshwantpura.		Gutta amount
6 Kariahalli		P. Fl. V
7 Kadasapura		63 - 8 - 0
8 Kolol Chinhalli.		(Initialled) Robert Cole Superintendent of Inam Settlements.
to be given to party in Column 8 in Kayam Gutta. In this village the following items are included—		Taluk Register of 1878
1 Agada Ummya P. Fl. V 1 — " — "		Present Holder Mahadeva Row's father Chintamba Row
2 Kurubu " " — 2 — "		
3 Balagai " " — 2 — "		
4 Jadagai " " — 3 — "		
Total 1 — 7 — "		Rs 185 - 9 - 7.
2 Cut of Sale by Government of this village and of Jeshwantapura to party in column 10 by Superintendent Bangalore Division in execution case 260 of 1869 Dated 13. September 1871.		

Summat

Residence, name, age, &c., of the present owner.	Relation to original grantee.	If unconnected with the original holder, possession how obtained and in what year.
10	11	12
Mahadeva Row of Jangamkote of Devanhalli Taluk	Alienee and grand nephew of original grantee.	By purchase.

Hosakote —— Taluk —— Bangalore ——

5
93

Assistant's opinion and recommendation.

13

Notice served on Inahadeva Row on 31st August 1878.

11-9-78 (Initialled) Robert Cole
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements.

2 The party in column 5 has produced the document No. 2 in column 7, which is returned to him.— Docket No 1 was received from the Division Commissioner's office. ——

3 confirmed on the existing patta, at Rs 186 Subject to all Local Fund and Irrigation cesses.

4 Rights to Sayer are conceded to all the 8 villages if any such item was realized in any of them, but are not now in the Holder's enjoyment and are therefore reserved. Rights to Abkari and Forests are reserved.

5 A valuation Survey is desired.

Hosakote
12th September 78 } (Signed) Robert Cole
Superintendent of
Inam Settlements.

6 Revised as per the Dewan's proceedings No. 4701-9/133 dated 2nd September 1881. ——

Reple

No. 598

Do. General Records.

4441 97-11-95

DF 13 of 94

AR 164-92-16 59

1898

No. 2759

Name of Petitioner Desakulakarni Subbar

Village Narasapur

Taluk Malur

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 5-8-98

Date of Receipt 7-5-98

Date of Disposal

No of Enclosure

ABSTRACT

With reference to Endorsement No 80 of 6-7-95 from the Head Assistant-Regent, the petitioner states that he submitted a petition on 25-10-95 and reminders on 1-6-96 and 29-10-96, concerning the unjust transfer of the land belonging to Gadachannahalli, Kolar Taluk, to Chikkanna-halli Malur Taluk. He prays that with reference

RCR
12/5/98

Please see the General No 3845 of 95-96 from Survey Supdt in No 6642/12-A-95 for which the file was sent to you as per Slip Board dated 6-9-95 by your Branch.

13-6-98

Gl No: 6221/460 from Inam Supdt, Letter No: 69 of 25/2/98 with DF 13 of 94 was submitted to the Asstt Regr on 2/3/98. There is no further entry in the Form Register.

AK
11/7/98

Subd
20/9/98

Yr Hyd is with me

by 20/5/05

1) Compile the open file
2). Ask the document file
by the petr in his petn
C No 112/1421 of 24/6/95
translate in the recis ?
If not they should be translated
Head Asst

by 2/7/05

Translation of Endorsement & Petr's petitions

9/7/98

Compiled
9/7/98

To Mr Krishnaraya

5.7.98

Received
4-7-98 (1-30 PM)

Settlement
of the accounts of Diwan
Province of 1905. The case may
be settled at an early
date.

mg.
10/5/08

Per also state, that his son
Venkata Krishniah who had
filed the above appeal to Govt,
died 4 months ago and requests
that intimation may be given
to him of the date of hearing
the said appeal

Wdly
11/5/08

Petition for Writ of Certiorari
No. 2759
Filed 7/5/74

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REC'D
DATE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the [illegible] Court entered in this proceeding on [illegible].

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the [illegible] Court is reported at [illegible]. The opinion of the [illegible] Court is reported at [illegible].

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § [illegible].

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. [illegible]
2. [illegible]

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS INVOLVED

[illegible]

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

[illegible]

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

[illegible]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the [illegible] Court.

Respectfully submitted,

[illegible]

ಕಲಿಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮತ್ತೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ನೋಡಿ ಆನಂದಿಸುತ್ತಾರ

(18)

NR 164-92-17

1506/3164

[illegible]

By Order

[illegible]

For Secretary

No. Pol 5.9.00
413-14 6

Copy forwarded by the
Supt. of Rev. Survey
in Mysore in Mysore
for information with
the records
received with the
docket No. 664.
12/11/95

4/9/W

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1892-93

192

(Land Rev.)

File No. 164-92

Serial Nos. 1-17.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-17

in Part B for September 1892

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Venkatakrishnaya, Kayamguttadar of Kolol Chinnahalli, Hosakote Taluk regarding certain lands.

Judgment

WD 2238—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Countermanded

Appeal No 3164 of 1893.4 (10)

Appt

Venkatakrishnaiah

Kanjamgutta dar of Kolal

Chinnahalli, Hoskoti Taluk.

Petitioner is the present

Kanjamgutta dar of Kolal Chennahalli

Hoskote Taluq — The boundary dispute

of this Village was settled in May 1884

by the Survey Dept, & the former holder of the

Village presented a Petition to the Dy Comr

in Dec 1884 protesting against the

settlement, & the Dy Comr instead of

rejecting the Petition as one beyond his

powers to settle, admitted it ordered

a local enquiry — A local enquiry was

held & no definite conclusion was

arrived at — the Dy Comr finally rejected the Appts

claim in September 1892 on the ground that he had no power

to enquire into the matter — the Petitioner

then appealed to Govt & they admitted the

appeal on the ground that the Appt was misled

by the action of the Dy Comr & was

not responsible
for the delay in
preferring the appeal
to Govt against the
decision of the
Settlement Dept —

As coming to
the merits of the case,
appellant relies on
two documents — viz ×
1 account of Krishnaiya
1865-66.
of the village, & the
account of Seddhan ×
1859-60.
for the Devarivellys of
Chakkanharsandalli —

Both the ~~Kiamps~~ accounts
were before the Survey
Dept when the dispute
was settled, ~~the Survey &~~
~~Dept both to notice~~
~~of the accounts of the Shanbhag~~
though the accounts
of Krishnaiya Shanbhag
produced was an
authenticated copy

× Given in
correspondence with
appeal below
Ep

the Learned Dept took the
matters contained in
those accounts into
consideration, & rejected Appellant's
claim on the ground
that there was abundant
evidence that the land
claimed by the Petitioners
did not belong to her
ward.— Even the
subsequent enquiry held
by the Assistant shows that
the land described
(about 138 acres) have not
been in the possession of
the ~~Govt~~ Rayamyalladers
for upwards of 30 years.—
& the accounts produced
do not show conclusively
that the land belongs to
Petitioners.

Under these circumstances,
Govt. consider that Appellant
has not made out any
case to establish
her claim, & his

appeal is
therefore finally
rejected
LCL
7/7/94

9/7

It is ~~appeared~~ that
her appeal has been
dismissed as he failed
to make out a case
that the land in under
dispute belongs to
her village. ~~It~~ while
on the other hand, there
is evidence that the
land [redacted]
has been long in the
enjoyment of Lesser
villages LCL

Draft
LCL 9/7
prepared
SWN 7/7

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA

9-2-93

Review application No. 345 of 3164
to 5. March 93 submitted by Desai Venkata Krishnaiah of Karsa
pur Malur Taluk on the decision
of Government rejecting his appeal of
15-12-92 against the Survey Super-
intendent's decision refusing peti-
tioner's complaint that certain lands
of his Kayam fulla Village of Kolal
Chinnahalli of Hoskote Taluk were
Erroneously Surveyed into the neigh-
boring Government Village of Cha
Karsanhalli of Malur Taluk

Srinivas Rao and Subbanna were
the Kayam pattadars of Bachenahalli alias
of Jadara Chinnahalli and Kolal
Chinnahalli in the Hoskote Taluk
Bangalore District.

In October 1880 these Villages
having been sold for arrears of revenue
Subedar Abdul Hyder Khan bought
them.

In May 1889 petitioner Venkata
Krishnaiah bought them from
Khan.

During the Survey settl
Hoskote Taluk held in 1884

arose as regards the boundary between the Kayamputta Village of Kolal Chinnahalli in the Hoskote Taluk and the Government Village of Chakkarsanhalli in the Anekal Taluk.

Mr. F. B. Clarke the Asst. Supt. Rev. Survey. ~~came~~ went over the ground with the parties concerned and having gone through the accounts produced by Kayamputtadar and the Shanbogue of the Govt. Village and also other Evidence cited by them, considered the Scanty Evidence produced by the Kayamputta Village to be unsatisfactory and that on the other hand the accounts of the Government Village were fuller and more to the point and taken in conjunction with the above inscriptions at points 4 & 5 in the map, which not only faces the Chakkarsanhalli Village land is also clearly mentioned in the accounts, they showed that the greater portion of the land under dispute belonged to the Government Village. He therefore decided the dispute by drawing the line of Settlement from points 1 & 4 and thence on to point 5 in the accompanying Takkarshasha.

No. 33 of 2-5-84.

+ Amounting to 1 & 2 acres.

This settlement was duly confirmed by the Superintendent of Survey. 9-5-84.

Thereupon the former Puttadar Hyderkhan

29-8-84 — Submitted a petition to the Survey Superintendent representing that a great portion of his lands belonging to the Kayampatta village containing a village tile, stone-faced well &c. was during Survey erroneously measured into the Government village of Chikkarasanhalli and praying that the mistake might be rectified.

No. 7030 of 12-9-84 & No. 142 - do — In reply Col. Rutherford granted the petitioner an Endorsement to the effect that as Mr. Clarke's settlement of boundary was correct it could not be altered.

26-12-84 — The petitioner then represented the matter to the Dy. Commissioner Bangalore who sent it on to the Amildar, Hoskote Taluk, for Enquiry and report.

31-5-85 — The Amildar after Examining the witnesses cited by the petitioner and other records stated that it was clear that about 60 or 70 Khandis of lands belonging to the Kayampatta Villages of Kolal Chinnahalli and Padada Chinnahalli were surveyed into the Government Village of Chikkarasanhalli and requested that the Patel and Shanbogue of Pillegondanahalli with the accounts of the latter village might be directed to be sent, therein

21-6-85 — Accordingly the Dy. Commissioner Bangalore requested the Dy. Commr. Kolar to do the needful in the matter, but excepting a few stamped correspondence between the Amildars of Hoskote and Mulur on the subject there seems to be nothing in the

file to show that they actually appeared before the Amildar as directed.

The Amildar, Hoskote Taluk having requested the Amildar of Malur to appoint a day on which they could meet at the Takkar land and settle the dispute the latter asked the permission of the Dy. Commr. who directed him in directing permitting him directed to hold a joint inspection and inquiry and to submit a joint report in the matter. No. 600 of 15-10-89 No. 1000 of 14-3-90 No. 794 of 20-3-90.

Thereupon both the Amildars met at the land under dispute, inspected it in company with the Patel, Shanbogue and the Villagers of Chakarasanhalli and also with petitioner Venkatakrishniah the purchaser of the Kayampalli Village, and measured the land and submitted the following report with a detail of measurement 20-6-91 No. 670 of 22-6-91.

Kolal Channahalli containing the land under dispute is situated to the West of Chakarasanhalli according to the Chitta account of Siddarti, Lands, Inam Nos. 43, 45, 66 & 60, are situated in the middle, and on the boundary of the above two Villages. No. 44 is mentioned in the said accounts as Takkar Land belonging to Government and in the Enjoyment of Poojaris as Kulgaval and the dispute to be settled. It is also mentioned as "late No. 40". On inspection of the Situation of this land No. 40 (i.e. No. 40 of Kanipala) it coincides only with the land No. 43 of Siddarti but not with No. 44. Poojari Venkatakrishniah possessed this land No. 44 as the land belonging to his Palli Village now under dispute. The Villagers

on the other hand contends that the said land belong to their Village, that there are three GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE Singamadi stones with inscriptions on the West of it and that as the land is situated within the boundary the Survey Depart. following it fixed the boundary stones and included in their Village - Of the three inscription stones above referred to, one is in Hajie no. 62 and the other in 43. The 3d is not mentioned in the Chitta of this Village.

It is learnt from the Chamlapur Heri on duty that "Padrajinama" between the Government and Kayampalli Village was not effected during Survey. The pattadar having complained to the Survey Depart. that the latter land was surveyed into Government Village Col. Rutherford the Dy. Supt. of Survey granted him an Endorsement to the effect that the boundary settled by Mr. Clarke being correct he could not alter it. The said Endorsement also stated that the land measuring one Kolage, which was mentioned from the statement of Chamlapur and others to have been formerly cultivated by a Rayat of Chatterachalli was also surveyed into the above Village this batai cultivation is not confirmed by the accounts. On Enquiring the Chamlapur & the Rayats, the former state that the land was not so cultivated and the latter say that one Achappa had cultivated it, but that, as he is dead it could not be stated he cultivated the land of Government or Kayampalli Village -

× Regimama regarding boundary

No. 7030 of 12-9-84

Owing to the dubious remarks made in the Chitta about land no. 44 which is now claimed by Kayampallidar and disputed by the Villagers of Chakkarasanahalli and owing to this land not being situated on the boundary line between these two Villages with Nos. 43, 45, 46 & 60 and as the accounts do not support, it cannot be stated that the said land belongs to Government Village of Chakkarasanahalli. On Enquiring the Amildar of Hoskote for any records to show whether it belongs to Kayampalli Village he stated that, except Jamabandi register, Paimaishi and other accounts of the village were not forthcoming. During Paimaishi Kayampalli land alleged to have been measured into Government Village, measured 138 - 2.

The Villagers of Government Village state that since 30 years, when Siddarti accounts were prepared, the land under dispute is in their Enjoyment - the land is somewhat jungly being overgrown with trees and shrubs. Kayampalladar contends that it was in his Enjoyment and would produce written proof. Thus he failed to do though waited for two days the statement of the Government Villagers is worthy of credit as they had previously disputed during Paimaishi of Siddarti that the land belongs to them. Hence they could not have allowed an intruder to occupy it. Hoskote Amildar stated he could offer his opinion only on perusal of the papers recorded during Survey

23-9-91

Subsequently the petitioner having been reported to have cut a tree in the Cattivar land hon. Coopsami Moodliar investigated the matter, ordered the tree to be sold for Government and prohibited the petitioner from entering upon the land until his case was finally decided.

ho. 2254 of 16-2-92 &
ho. 465 of 23-2-92

16-3-92

Against this order the petitioner appealed to the Dy. Commissioner praying that the Karaikuchi villagers might otherwise be prohibited from entering upon the land and also for the cancellation of the sale of the tree till final orders were passed by him in regarding the Cattivar land.

16-9-92

The Dy. Commissioner on enquiry found and pronounced the records of the case declining to interfere with the decision of the Survey Superintendent and added that if the petitioner was not satisfied with the said decision he should have appealed to Government in time instead of petitioning the Dy. Commissioner and his proceedings thereon which were to no purpose

15-12-92

Petitioner Venkatakrishniah thereupon appealed to Government contending that if Hyder Khan the previous holder of the village, who addressed a petition complaining against the order of the Survey Superintendent had been told that there is appeal to Government he would have done it long ago, ~~and that there was no necessity for making a petition complaining against the Survey Superintendent declining to interfere~~

The Government in rejecting the

appeal, declined to interfere with the Survey
Settlement effected so far back as 1884 / 9-2-93

On this the petitioner addressed a memorial 10-3-93
to H.H. the Maharaja alleging that the Mofussilar
received illegal gratification from the
Ryots of Government Village of Chakkaramballe
and measured into the latter village more
than 3/4 of the Inam Village, including a
Village Site; Stone faced well and the Inam
lands of Chambopet & Toti, that the Survey
Apte. Supdt. & Survey Supdt. to whom
petitioner's vendor appealed upheld the
action of the Mofussilar and decided that
the lands belongs to the Government Village,
that petitioner's vendor there upon petitioned
the Dy. Commissioner, which authority
was in those days adjudicating upon
such disputes, that the Dy. Commissioner
admitted the application and ordered local
inspection, that the Amildars of Hoskote
and Bagur inspected the Spot and reported
that the tract in dispute belongs to the
Inam Village. that in the meantime on the
complaint of the Patel of the Government Village
in regard to a tree which petitioner cut on the
land in his Enjoyment the Asst. Supdt. Kolar
Distt.: ordered the tree to be sold for
Government and prohibited petitioner from
entering upon the land, & that he thereupon
appealed to the Dy. Comr. who declined to
interfere saying that he should have
appealed to Govt. from the order of the
Survey Supdt. and the proceedings since
1884 were all to no purpose - and

that if the Dy. Commissioner had declined to entertain the petition and referred him to Government he would have at once appealed to Government.

1-9-93 The appeal was thereupon admitted.

B.K. Mr. Clerk's report is in English

Kaiyam Pillai's statement before Mr. Clarke:-

19-1-84 As regards my claim about the Kunti, well, the Mango and other trees in the Zakkar land belong to my village:- The wells known as Basappan Bhavadi & Sangappaji Bhavadi, the Aswaraji and the land known as Chamapura Vola situated to the East of the Village, which are cultivated on Rataji known by a Rayat of Chakkarsanhalli - are mentioned in the Paimaishi accounts of last Khordava prepared in Maharati. Consequently all lands which are included in the Zakkar portion should be included in my village. I do not know for what purpose the Kuifa mucre stones were fixed. The Zakkar land has been in my enjoyment till now. I have submitted copy of the accounts above referred to. Besides these I have not with me any other accounts &c.

3.-4-84. Statement of Patil & Shanbhog of Chakkarsanhalli Village:-

Since it is stated in the accounts of Siddhal the Kanjar land measuring 44 referred to in the Zakkar Kaifiat with a boundary of 10 khandaga 6 kolagas, was the one disputed by the Village of Kolar Chinnahalli, since the & Zakkar of our Village continued at the time that the above land belonged to our Village and since the land been in our Enjoyment from [illegible] the land was included in our Village and measuring [illegible]

Same accounts mention that the Land with the well, stone faced Kunte & Tope are included in the Survey No. 58 of the Kasaba Village Map no. 58 with the Measurements of 4 — 3 — 1½. The above well, Kunte & the Tope have been in our enjoyment till now. Moreover it is stated in the said accounts, vide Survey No. 61, that Twenty more stone inscriptions of Lingamalli, Sodderamanalli, Kolalchinnahalli and Chikkarsanhalli are situated on the Rock. accordingly those stones are on the said Spot now. Besides there are three Twenty more stones on the boundary of our Village in the Kasaba Talkar Land. We have furnished copy of accounts relating to Twenty more stone, situated in the boundary of our Village. Besides this we have no other accounts the Talkar Land has been in our Enjoyment from time immemorial. and the cattle of our village [illegible] It is a forest Land. Consequently it is never cultivated

Submitted for orders —

Shanbogue Sanjeevappa, my father was the Kasaba of Chikkarsanhalli. during his lifetime he ordered the Patawari to be made in my name the accounts above referred to we have none the cultivated portion entered as Survey No. 52, the Talkar Land, measuring 6 Kolaga 3 Halla [illegible] Kasaba to one Chikkka of our Village two years ago. the paying the Kandayam therefor, he is cultivating & enjoying the produce. One Channaya of our Village being the Talkar of the Tope has been taken the fallen trees. As the Land was overgrown with jungle during the famine of Siddarthi one Twenty more stone might have been mentioned in the accounts inasmuch as the stone which are opposite the Talkar Land. But if the Twenty more stones are seen it could be decided to which Village the above Talkar Land belongs.

Post 11
Case for
hearing
Exc. Asst
Asst
for orders
Sep
18/6/96

Posted 6 5th July 1896.
Notice to be sent without delay
also docket to Asst Comm Regr
BR 18/6

Jamin Ramanathi Sashwara - Samma-
Gattaraja Sastra - Kolar Chinnapalli
Bagepalli Taluk - for the year
Krodhana -

Total Sq. Yds - 3,15,496 : Equivalent
dry Extent 4 Kandis, 19 Kadims 8 3/4 Yards
Deduct: 400 = 1 Extent
2,12,160 = 3 Kandis. 6 Kadims 14 3/4 Yds

Particulars.
Village
Beckarak village Site - 102470 = 5 Yards
Land containing rocks &c 2,09920 = 3K. 5K. 14 1/2 Yds.
Stone faced well and
Amarailebanjiga
Basappa ——— 2,240 = 11 1/4 Yards
2,12460 = 3K. 6K. 14 3/4 Yds.
Balance — 1,0336 = 1K. 12K. 5 Yards
Deduct
Shambogi Jaridaru - 12288 = 3 Kandis 13 1/2 Yards
Balance Sirkar land - 91048 = 1K. 8K. 7 1/2 Yds
Particulars.
Belanjiga Chennappa - 86,976 = 1K - 7K - 3 Yds.
Shambogi Devaru - 4072 = 1K - 4 1/2 Yds.

Varnacishipalle of Kolal Cheinnachalle
for the year Akshaya.

Dry land -

1. Kechavk village Site = 1024 = 5 Kadas
1. Land containing pools . 20920 = 3K.5KH.½P.
1. Stone faced well &
Channel belonging to
Basappa —— 2240 -
1. Land to the East of the
village which is being
cultivated for Balaiah
Chikkarayanahalli village . 36,864 = 11 Kadas 8 ¼ Kadas
1 Land Situated to the
Eastern of the village
belonging to the Chambogi
Jagir Inam —— 12,288 - a-3-13½

K O.

C. Balaiji land belonging
to Gupt. Kopa Mettalkki - 6912 - a-2-3/4
Govt. Balaiji waste land - 4072 - a-1-4½

1 Do - cultivated by Gundara
-halli Gupta —— 6400 = a-2-a
a - Do —— 36800 - a-11-P-.

Thasti Chilla of Chakarasana halli for Siddarti (1859).

Survey. no. 71

42. S. W. of the village. dry waste unfit for cultivation. old no. 45.

To the East no. 28
West no. 43
North no. 41 waste
South. the boundary of Eswaralapura

do.

43. West of the village - Jungly - unfit. old no. 40

To the East. nos. 40, 41 & 42
West - the boundary of Lanja-pura - Easterly as far as the Bellary cross road & near the Kunte of Vijayana.
North - the boundary of Kudlu cross road, as well as the boundary of the pit near Talavar Eswaraiah and also nos. 40 and 45 (waste)
South - the boundary of Eswara-pura as far as Lanja - Munoo Lasana.

do.

44. West of the village. this is the land pertaining to the boundary dispute of Lanjapura and Sola Chennahalli & Kolar Chinnahalli

Survey Boundary of Zalwar and others of Chikkarasanahalli say that the land belongs to Chikkarasanahalli. The boundary has been Engraved the land as grazing ground up to the present year. The Talwar should be settled. Old no. 60.

To the East. nos. 43, 45 & 60
West. The lands belonging to Pampasura, Pala-Chinnahalli & Kolar Chinnahalli.
North. Land belonging to Kolar Chinnahalli
South. no. 43 and the boundary of Pampasura

45. To the West of the village - dry waste. Survey no. 60
Nallada Kola. fit for cultivation

To the East. no. 50
West. no. 44 (Talwar land)
North. no. 44 - do & no 46
South. no. 43

46 To the North of the above. dry. fit for cultivation. Waste. S. no. 59

To the East. no. 47
West. no. 44 Talwar
North. no. 58. road to Sivanapura
South. no. 45. (waste)

58. To the North West of the village. dry waste S. no. 71
unfit. Kharab.
To the East. no. 71
West. no. 44. Talwar land of Kolar Chinnahalli
North. no. 59
South no. 46

Hdis Contains one alada trē & one devarajanikal trē.

Survey No. 53. bed of tank

60. North West of the village - bed of Southern tank - liable to be submerged in water.

To the E - No. 59
W - No. 44 - Tākkan land of Kolar Chinnahalli
No - No. 61 (waste)
S - No. 58 (Ghatai)

S. No. 71.

61. North West of the village - Communal waste - unfit for cultivation

To the E - No. 62
W - Lingasamudra Stone of Sonnenahalli, Indrasamudra halli & Kolar Chinnahalli Situated on a rock.
No - the boundary of Sonnenahalli village.
S - No. 60 bed of the tank.

do

62. North West of the village - Contains hillocks - Waste - unfit for cultivation

To the E - No. 63
W - No. 61
N - No. 69 - & bears the boundary land of Sonnenahalli - the Lingasamudra Stone of this village is in this
S - No. 60 - bed of the tank

Translation of Enclosure to
Pet. No. 1421 - dy 24-6-95

(1) Dewan's office Encl: No. 1506 +
3164, dy 18th/24 July 1894.
(in English).

2. Deposition of Hyderkhan, late
Kayam Guttedar - before the
15-1-85: Amildar, Hoskote. -

"My petition to the Dy Comr
was read to me. It is true that
I wrote it - I purchased the two
villages, viz Kolala Channenahalli
+ Gaddada Channenahalli, in
auction sale in 1880. The Pi-
-maishi Patki of Hrothanalas-
shewing the bound-
-aries of these villages has been
submitted by me with the records -
Although I gave the officer that
surveyed, at the time of Survey,
dakhlas shewing the locality,
yet the said officer has, without
considering all of them, an-
-nexed one of the two Kayam
Gutta

Inthe villages purchased by me-
-viz Kolal Channanahalli, to
Sakarsanahalli, Melur Taluk-
I have herewith submitted the
Inam-Title Deed and the Sale
Certificate granted to me in
connection with those two
villages. None of these talkaras
were ~~broadly~~ mentioned when the sale of,
the said village was notified
in the Gazette as usual, and
yet now, at the time of Survey,
a whole village has been annexed
into the said Sakarsanahalli
by an infringement of my
right, and bounds also have
been fixed. Therefore in accordance
with office accounts and the
certificates I hold, the whole
of the said village has to be
given over to me. The Kanyam-
-Guttadar (a female) has once before applied
for permission to cut the
"Amarai trees" on account of
her inability to pay the Guttige-
-Amount: this dakhla should
be referred to. And also in

the

the days of the late Amildar Timmaiya criminal enquiry of the ~~ady~~ ryots of the adjacent village took place in the matter of their grazing their Cattle, and a document in stamped paper has been executed to the effect that the land in dis-pute belongs to none but the Kayamgutadar. The docu-ment is effected between the ryots and the person who obtains the land on lease from the Kayamgutadar. The afore-said Criminal records of 1874 should also be had for reference

1874.

=

3. Deposition of Ramegowda and others of Hettaleki, Kolar Taluk -d 23-3-'85- at the Hoskote Mk. Cutchery-

Veerachari - Panchalada.
Muni Rameyowda - Patel.
Muni Ramanna - Hettalli.

: Petition to District Hugu of Hyder Khan, Patel of Sulibele and purchaser in auction-sale of the two kayamgutta villages Kolal Chennahalli + Gudada Chennahalli in Hoskote taluk, has been read

to

to us. Since the days of our father we have been having the said two villages on "lease"[x] year by year being the Kayamputtadars. We have ~~got~~ the full knowledge of the boundaries of these villages. Kolal Chennanahalli and Gaddada Chennanahalli are adjoining. To the east of these is situated Sakkarsanahalli of Kolar Taluk. ~~Both of the lands~~ Kolal Chennanahalli and Gaddada Chennanahalli have been in the enjoyment of the Kayamputtadars from the beginning. Out of the lands that used to be leased out to us those of a whole village have been in the late Survey annexed to Sakkarsanahalli, Kolar taluk, and bounds stones have been fixed. To the east of the said two Kayamputta villages there are Basappa's Well and tope with one banyan ~~tree~~ and two mango trees. The said well, tope and the village-site of Kolal Chennanahalli have been included in the bounds of Sakkarsanahalli. Lands yielding about 6 or 7 Kandies of dry crop have been taken over

to

[x] Sub-lease.

to Sakkarasanahalli from the Rayampetta villages. When the same land had been leased out to us, i.e. in 1874, we had grown grass on it. The villagers of Sakkarasanahalli grazed their cattle on it, when, we put in a firyad in this Taluk. They were criminally prosecuted and fined. On their stating that they would not meddle with this land, a Karar was executed in a Stamped paper ~~to~~ the name of one of us- Kuruba Muniramanna. That paper (Karar) is with Hyder-khan, and it was written by the very villagers of Sakkara-sanahalli.

=

4. Karar on one-rupee Stamped Paper written by the villagers* of ~~Hettakki~~ Chakkarasanahalli to Kuruba Muni Ramanna of Hettakki.

& 16-10-74

In the matter of our illicit grazing of cattle on the Hulgawal of

* Anantacharu.
Jammegowda.
Hanumantaiya.
Achaiya. + others.

of the two villages Koral Chennanahalli and Gadada Chennanahalli of Hoskote taluk which are leased out to you on Sapya-tenure for 10 years, you put in a firyad in the Court of the Taluk Magistrate, Hoskote. The case was enquired into and we were found guilty. As we live in neighbouring villages and hold equal positions in Society* we have effected a compromise (in the presence of the Gurikaras of the place) and the com-plaint has been requested to be withdrawn a request for the withdrawal of the complaint has been made. The request has been complied with. We are forbidden to graze our cattle hereafter on lands found by the Sircar Accounts to lie within the limits of your village, except with the consent of yours or the Jodidar. If we so graze, we shall be liable as well for punishments that maybe inflicted on us by Government as for the loss sustained by you."

* ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯೋನ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವೆವು.

2.

=

5. Inspection "list" reports of the Amildar and Shirastedar of Hoskote and Malur taluks respectively, prepared as per Dy. Comr's order No 794, dt 30-3-90 dt 20-6-91.—

On the side of the villages of Kolar Chennenahalli

On behalf the side of the Jodidars, Venkatakrishnaiya, the purchaser of Kolal Chennana-halli, appeared to show the lands in dispute and stated that it had not only been annexed to Sircar-Chakara-sanahalli, but also bundles had been fixed in the Survey so as to bring it within the limits of that village. The land pointed out by him is a banjar overgrown with trees, and lies to the west of Chakara-sanahalli but between Kolar Chennenahalli and Chakarasa-nahalli. The villagers of Sircar-Chakarasanahalli stated that the above land belonged to their village, that there were three Linga-mudre stones towards the west within which the said land was, + that the Survey Officer was guided by those stones in marking out the limits.

+(Kolal Chennenahalli)

" The accounts of Siddan and

and other years were examined with
a view to determine the question
whether the land disputed for by
Venkatakrishnaiya belonged to
Sircar or Jodi village. The
talavar - inamti land which
lies to the east of the land under
dispute was measured in Siddhanti and
It is given No 39. Starting from this
and proceeding towards the westward
we examined the maji Nos 43, 45 & 46.
To the west of these lies the No 44
which is overgrown with trees or
a "gidakattu jamin". In the
Siddhanti Chitta it is given No 44
with a remark against it to the
effect that the talavar, patel
and others of Chakaranahalli
state that it is a land in dispute
between the villages of Gangapura,
Gattachannahalli & Kola Chennahalli,
that moreover the jodidars have
been enjoying it as a pasture-land,
that the dispute is pending
disposal, that its old no. is 40,
that the pimaishi of the land
was not held at the time, & that
its extent is about 600 yds
from east to west, which is
equal to 6 Kandis. The maji
No 40 referred to above is the No 40
referred to mentioned in the accounts of the
year Pangala. On examining

its boundaries it was found to belong to №43 and not to 44. During survey the said №44 is given №71.

"As for the three Linga mudre Sasanas pointed out by the villagers of Chakarasanahalli, the account shows one in the old №62 + one in №43. There is no dakhle in the accounts of this village regarding the third Linga mudre Sasana. Owing to the ~~doubtful~~ dubious remarks made in the Chitta of Siddarti, and owing also to the absence of any №s between Chakarasana-halli and Kolal Chennahalli, except 60, 43, 45 & 46, both when the lands were inspected and the accounts were examined, it cannot be said on sufficient grounds that the maji №44 does belong to Sircar Chakara-sanahalli. Somehow or other it has been annexed during survey, to Chakarasana halli, and the boundary marked out.

"It has been ascertained from the then Shanbhoga that at

at the time of Survey no Boundary-
Razinama was effected between
the Sircar Village and the Kayam
Gutta village.

" The extent of land in dispute
that has been taken over to ~~the~~
Chakanasanahalli has been
found, on ~~ex~~ inspection, to be .... acres.

" The Jyodidars put up a
firyad to Mr. Elliott, the asst. Supdt.
urging that this land did
not+ belong to Govt. On that
Mr. Rutherford passed the order
N° 2030, d 12-9-84 stating that as
the boundary fixed was correct
it could not be altered. The
Amildar of Hoskoté has informed, on request,
that, excepting the Quit-rent
Register, there are no Paimaishi
and other Accounts in the Records
to show that the land in dispute
belongs to the Kayam Gutta Village-
Kolaé Chennahalli

+ "belonged" (?) ×

=

6. Depositions of Villagers of
Chakanasanahalli -
d 20-6-91.

Chamarayappa
Pennegowda
Lachinegowda } The land alleged
to have been
purchased
by

by Venkatakrishnaiya and
pointed out to us this morning
as belonging to Kolal Chennena-
halli, belongs to Sircar Chakka-
-sandrahalli village but not to
Kayamgutta village. It has been
in our enjoyment since the
time of our ancestors. This fact
may become evident if Shan-
-bhogue Sanjeevarayappa be
examined. About 25 years
ago we had grown paddy in
only one year in the Swampy
land which lies to the west
of this land. We cannot say
with certainty whether
the land so cultivated belongs
to Sircar village or Kayam-
-gutta village. We have
listened to the Survey Dy. Superin-
-tendent's Endt. No. 2080 read to
us. It is mentioned therein
that a villager of Chakkarasan-
-halli carried on batai culti-
-vation on a piece of takaran
land equivalent to 1 kolaga.
Of us, I (Lachappa) hear that
it was so cultivated by my
father Mallala Gangaiya while

is

is dead now. I did not see him cultivate it. ~~I cannot assert with certainty that~~ I am doubtful whether he cultivated the land belonging to Sircar village or Kayampatta village: it might be the former. There was one orderly by name Ummar Sabi, who used to visit, but he is dead. No Kandayam of whatever kind has been paid to Kayampatta dars on account of the land in dispute being used as hulgaval. Their land to the west of this had been many a time taken by us for hulgaval-Kandayam.

20-6-'91

Shanbhogue Subbarayappa } I have heard the deposition given by the above ~~people~~ men. I have looked after the Shanbhogy-duties of this village from 1848 to 1860. During those years no batai cultivation took place as the ryots allege.

20-6-91

Shanbhogue Sanjeevarayappa } I worked at the Shanbhogy office from

from 1861 to Vishu (1881-82)
and my son has been working
since Chitrabhanu. No balai
cultivation has ever taken place
in land No 44 under dispute.
In this land which is ~~not~~ over-
-grown with trees (Sidakattu) the
villagers of Chakarasanahalli
have been grazing their cattle,
and it has, as they say, remained
in their enjoyment. No Kan-
dayam has been paid to
Kayam guttadars for so grazing.

=

7. Copy of Ajamaishi-Patti
of Kolal Chennenahalli for
Krodhana and Akshaya.
(in Marathi)

8. Chitta of the year Ananda
for Chakarasanahalli.

9. Do: — of Siddharthi for
(Translated in the Memo or.
"precis".)

10. Copy of Order No 2254
of 16-2-92 passed by Mr. Kuppu-
-Sawmy Mood^y, Assistant Com-
-missioner on the report No 344

3

& 4-1-92 of the Amildar of Malur
taluk in the matter of the
fireyad of Hyderkhan, Kayam-
-futtadar of Kolal Chennenahalli.
urging that a land of his
village had been annexed to Sircar
Chakarasanahalli

" This record is returned. If ~~Copies~~
~~of the~~ papers asked for by the arzidar
are (not) in the records there is
no objection to ~~the grant of~~ their
copies being granted. The Survey
officers have annexed some lands
to Sircar Chakarasanahalli
and fixed the limits. Petr had
applied to the Dy Com^r, Bangalore
District for altering those limits.
Thereupon the Amildars of
Malur and Hoskote were directed
to inspect jointly and submit
a report on the decision arrived
at. ~~Accordingly~~ you (Amildar of Malur)
and the Amildar of Hoskote inspected accordingly.
The Amildar of Hoskote might
have submitted a report in the
matter separately to the Bangalore
District. You two Amildars

do

do not seem to have submitted your reports jointly. The Arzidar may, if he wishes, know the result by presenting himself before the Dy. Comr., Bangalore District. The takaran is one which is not to be decided in the Kolar District. This is a long standing takaran. Bounds have been fixed during the time of Survey after determining the boundaries of both the villages by referring to the Accounts. When the maji Jodidar (the present arzidar) complained to the Survey Superintendent as to the incorrectness of the boundary the latter officer has ordered on 12-11-84 to the effect that the boundary is correct, and that it cannot be altered. If the arzidar was not satisfied with this order he should have appealed against it in time to the Diwan, and got the matter settled. No references are forthcoming to show that he did so. He has

has not got the boundary question settled in any other way either. Under such circumstances it was wrong of the Jodidars to have trespassed on a ~~Govt~~-land situated within the boundary of Sircar village, and cut down trees thereon. The Jodidars should be given notice prohibiting them from cutting trees by trespassing upon the land in dispute until they obtain final orders in the ~~suit~~ boundary-question; and the villagers should be asked to watch them. Trees that are already cut down should be sold by auction, and the amount realised credited. The order should be given effect to and the records connected with it sent to the Dy Commissioner".

=

II. Notice.

From. Taluk Cutchery, Malur

To: Venkata Krishnappa & others,
Jodidars of Kolallhennenahalli, Hoskote taluk.
residing in Narasapura.

Your petition stating that you cut down a mango tree between the limits of Chakarasana halli and your village under the impression that it belongs to your village. This matter was reported to "huzur". It has been known that you [illegible] given the Endt. dt. 12-11-84 to the effect that it was decided in the survey that the land where the tree was situated belonged to Chakarasanahalli. Moreover the Amildars of Hoskote and Malur seem to have jointly inspected and submitted a report. If you want you may go to the D/Commr. Bangalore District and know the result. In future you are warned against not to trespassing the land in dispute and cut trees situate therein, until you get the boundary question finally settled."

9/7/88

Min - ute

Sub. to Secretary
5/10/96

Petn No 1421 of 1895-96
from Venkatā Krishnama
Naraparu, Malur taluk
Subject - claims regarding
boundaries fixed
under Bombay Act I
of 1865 between the
petrs Kayemputta village
of Kolal Bhimanahalli & the
Govt village of Bhakrasana
halli in Malur taluk

1 in Hoskoti taluk

The following is an extract
from the Govt decision of
8/7/94 (Sno 12, Open file)
" Pethine is the present
Kayemgutta dar of Kolal
Bhimanahalli, Hoskoti taluk
The boundary dispute.
of this village was settled

~~by the~~ in May 1884 by the
Survey Dept & the former
holder of the village presented
a petition to the Dy Comm^r
(Bampshr Dt) in December
1884 against the settlement
and the Dy comm^r instead of
rejecting the petition as one
beyond his province & settled
admitted it and ordered a
local enquiry. A local
enquiry was held & no
definite ~~Enquiry~~ conclusion
was arrived at and the
Deputy Comm^r finally
rejected appellant's claim
in Sept^r 1892 on the
ground that he had no
power to enquire into
the matter. Petitioner then
appealed to Govt and they
admitted the appeal on the
ground that appellant

x This is not quite accurate
The appeal was first rejected
by Mr Thornton the then
but was afterwards admitted
when the petr presented a
memorial to the Lieut Governor

was misled by the action of the Dy Comm^r & was not responsible for the delay in preferring his appeal to Govt against the decision of the Settlement Dept"

(2). The decision therefore on Govt stand rests on the merits, the petition disclosed no grievance as the land in dispute had not been in the enjoyment of the Kayemgudlavar for the past 30 years & that the accounts produced by the petrs were fully considered by the Survey Dept before the boundaries were fixed. The appeal was rejected after ~~hearing~~ the petrs was heard.

(3) In his petition No 1421 of 1895-96
(now pending disposal) addressed
to H.H the Rakarani-Regent,
the petr applied for a
review of the above
decision and urged that
the grounds of appeal had
not been properly appreciated
by the Councillors
The Dewan framed the
following order on the petn
"Rec Dept for report if
any grounds exist for review"
Thereupon the records were
called for & subt to Dewan
They seem to have been
returned to the Secretary in
or about May 1896 without
order on the petn presenting
a reminder petition in
April 1897. the records were

please see letter of

[illegible] up in July 1897
Since then, the Survey
Supt was requested to
send copies of certain items
Registers referred to in the
Inam Register relating
to the petr's Villages
These have been received

(4) The Inam Regr (Exh 9)
shows that the area of the
petr's Village was Rs 26-7-7,
the gulta being Rs 13-1-6.
The area confirmed after
the Survey was 90-28[a]-9
of which 89-2[a]-9 was
uncultivable
Now, in the accounts relied
upon by the petrs ie those
Krodhana & Akshaya (Translated
in the precis) the total

extent of the pet^{r}'s village
is given as 3,15,496 sq yds
or as 65 acres 2 odd

1 acre = 4840 sq. yds.

The extent comprised in
the pet^{r} after the boundary
settlement is 90-28
(on a gutta of 13)

On the ground also, the
pet^{r}'s application for
review may be rejected

(5). The documents produced
by the pet^{r} with his
review pet^{n} have been
translated. The agreement
by the villagers of Bhakra-
Sanahalli proves nothing
as there is nothing to identify
the land mentioned therein

14/14/8

There are no reasons
Reasons for Review
The review application
The order is reasonable

3/9/97

3/9/97

P.S There have been some remonstrance
pet^{ns} from the pet^{r} recently

5/10/95

Recd & Decided 16-10-95

LR 1506-92-1

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

(2)

No. 1506

Name of Petitioner. Venkata Narshinga Devathilkarni Kavangatta

Village. Chikanahalli

Taluk. Hoskote

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 15-12-92

Date of Receipt. 15-12-92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 9

ABSTRACT.

In 1889 May, the pet. purchased two contiguous villages of Gaddadachinnahalli & Kotadachinnahalli from the Sirkabeli Patel Hyder Khan. In 1884 during the survey, a large extent of land, containing tanks, wells, & Shantigi Inam of the latter village have been by misrepresentation annexed to the village of Chikanasandra Chakarsanapalli. In taking the Pets. representation to the Survey Dept. it was rejected & the Dy. Commr refused

The Petitioner Complains that a portion of his Jodi village has been surveyed into the neighbouring village of Chikanasandra in the Malur Taluk

The former holder of the village was Hyder Khan from whom the Petr purchased it in 1889.

Hyder Khan Complained to the Supdt of Revenue in 1884. The Complaint was rejected. (vide 20: 2030 of 12th Nov 1884).

Hyder Khan then addressed the Dy Comr. some enquiry was made and at last the Dy Comr. declined to interfere. observing that the appeal against the Supdt's order ought to have been made to Govt.

The Petr Contends that if the party had been told then & there to appeal to Govt he would have done it long ago & that there was no necessity for making a further enquiry after the Supdt declines to interfere.

The present appeal is calculated from the order of the Dy Comr's order - (16th sept 1892)

H. R.

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

from D Govt. Pleas for Revision & quashing the order

HR 20/1

in time as it was received
on 15th Dec 1892.

Orders solicited as
to whether the present
appeal should be
admitted.

Submitted to the
Council

M
6/2/93

R 29/2

The first decision
bearing on the
Survey Act effected
by an Act as 1884.

BS
9/2/93

MYSORE DEMANDS OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 1506(N)
DATE 15-12-92

(1)

1 ಸದರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ
1889 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಸದರಿ
ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ

2.- ಸದರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು 1889 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು

3 ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

(ਸ਼) ਮੁਦਾਲਾ ਨੰ: ਸਾਰੇ ਮੁਦਾਲਾਨ ਵਲੋਂ ਜਵਾਬ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਮੁਤਾਬਿਕ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਕਿ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਮੁਦਈ ਦਾ ਬਰਖਿਲਾਫ ਮੁਦਾਲਾਨ ਨਾਜਾਇਜ ਹੈ ਕਿਉਂਕਿ ਮੁਦਈ ਨੇ ਕੋਈ ਰਕਮ ਮੁਦਾਲਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਨਹੀਂ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਮੁਦਾਲਾਨ ਨੇ ਕੋਈ ਰਕਮ ਮੁਦਈ ਪਾਸੋਂ ਲਈ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਮੁਦਾਲਾਨ ਮੁਦਈ ਦੇ ਕਰਜਦਾਰ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਮੁਦਾਲਾਨ ਨੇ ਕੋਈ ਰਕਮ ਮੁਦਈ ਪਾਸੋਂ ਲੈਣੀ

5- [illegible]

6- [illegible]

7- [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1884 [illegible]

[illegible] 26 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1885 [illegible]

2 [illegible] 70 [illegible]

[illegible] - [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible]

[illegible] 344 [illegible]

[illegible]

1884 [illegible]

[illegible] 92 [illegible] 1691 [illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible]

8- [illegible]

23/2/92

LR 164-922 ✓ 20-8-92

13/2/93

No. 1506

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE (3)
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
1/13 February 1893.

Endorsement granted to Venkata Krishnaiah, Desaikulkarni, residing in Narasipur, Malur Taluk, and Kayamguttadar of Channahally in Hoskote Taluk and another village in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1506 dated 15-12-92

Petitioner is informed that Government decline to interfere with the Survey Settlement effected so far back as 1884.

2 The enc: are returned.

10/2/93

Draft (Council order)

"By Order,"

11/2

Chief Secretary.

11/2

10/2

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.

JR 164-92-3

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893

No. 345 / 3161

Name of Petitioner. Desa Mula Karnam Venkata Krishnaiah

Village. Narasapura

Taluk. Kolar

District.

Date of Arzi. 10th March 1893

Date of Receipt. 28th. 3. 93.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. — Ten —

ABSTRACT

Review application

Complaining of sei-
-ture of his Inam lands
having been resumed
Govt during the Survey
Settlement in 1884

Counted case

Submitted for orders -

This is a Memorial addressed to His Highness the Maharaja against the order passed by Govt on 9 February 1893 declining to interfere with the Settlement of a boundary dispute between Hazanguttahalli & Chakarsanhalli made by the Survey Department in 1884.

Petitioner's allegation is that the Mojamdar received illegal gratification from the ryots of the Govt village of Chakarsanhalli and mearmed into the latter village more than three-fourths of the Inam village including village site, stone-faced well & the Inam lands of Shambhag & Jati; that the Survey Asstt Supdt & Surveyor Supdt to whom Petrs appealed upheld the action of the Mojamdar & decided that the lands belonged to the Govt village; that Petrs thereupon petitioned the Deputy Commr which authority was in those days adjudicating upon such disputes; that the Dy Commr admitted the applicn and ordered a local inspection; that the Amildars of Hoskote (to which the Inam village is attached) and Malur (to which the Govt village is attached) inspected the spot with Sirkar Accounts & reported that the tract in dispute belongs

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore—7-9-92—1000.

the Inam village; that in the meantime on the complaint of the Patel of the Govt village in regard to a tree which Petr cut on land in his (Petrs) enjoyment the Govt Asstt Commr Kolaba Dt ordered the tree to be sold for Govt and prohibited Petr, by order dated 23rd Feb. 1893, from entering upon the land; that he thereupon appealed to the Dy Commr & prayed for a consideration of the proceedings which had taken place; but that Officer declined to interfere saying that Petr should have appealed to Govt from the order of the Survey Supt and the proceedings since 1884 were all to no purpose.

The Dy Commr has made the remark that the Petition & the Depositions & the proceedings thereon were to no purpose. The Petr urges that if the Dy Commr had declined to entertain the Petr and referred him to Govt he would have at once appealed to the Govt

There seems to be nothing in the Survey Act or in the Land Rev. Code to justify Dy Commrs instituting proceedings to examine the correctness of the Survey Supts decision. The mistake appears to have been bona fide on the part of both the Petitioner and the District authorities.

Recd 8/7.

do not think it right to interfere with a settlement made 10 years ago. Send to the North Mr Chentsal Asst.

CBP

15/8/93

The Dy Comr was wrong in entertaining the Petition, but he does so, & the Govt does not therefore appeal to Govt. The Dy Comrs rejection of the Petition in Sept 1892 was appealed to Govt within 3 months after the Dy Comrs order.

Under these circumstances I would admit the appeal, & send for the records of the Case.

CBP

4/9/93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
CAMP Mysore
REG'D. No. 345
DATE 27-5-93

(4)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 3164
DATE 31-5-93

Abstract put up

10
24-7-94

2

16.9.92 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಸಭೆಯು ಸೇರಿತು. ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದವರು ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ. ಸುಬ್ಬರಾಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ, ಎಂ. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್

Revised as per the Government Proceedings No 14223-5 dated 17th February 1894. P. Fl. 100-93

Vide the Statement received with the Surveyor Superintendent's yadi No 663 dated 3rd October 1896—

	A.	G.	Rs - as - p.
Total area and assessment	442	- 34	326 - 0 - 0
Deduct for 4 minor Inams	7	- 6	13 - 2 - 0
Balance	435	- 28	312 - 14 - 0

Particulars			
Unculturable	277	- 17	8 - 12 - 0
Dry Cultivated —	100	- 5	201 - 0 - 0
Culturable (waste)	23	- 7	12 - 8 - 0 (½ assd)
Wet Cultivated	4	- 15	16 - 14 - 0 —
Culturable - Do	13	- 3	11 - 12 - 0 Do
Garden Cultivated	14	- 1	58 - 0 - 0 —
Culturable - Do	3	- 20	4 - 0 - 0 Do
Total	435	- 28	312 - 14 - 0

11 Finally confirmed on the existing Gutta or Rupees 186-0-0

Dated 12-11-97

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

Compd

"Copy"

J P Grant

Dated 25th February 98.

Supt. of Inam Settlt.

District

7. Vide the Statement received with Survey Superintendent's Docket No. 395/11 dated 11th Aug 18

	A – G	Rs –
Total area and assessment	442 – 34	352
Deduct for four Minor Inams	7 – 6	13
Balance	435 – 28	339

Particulars

	A	G	Rs – as –
Uncultivable	277	– 17	8 – 12 – 0
Cultivated			
Dry	100	– 5	201 – 0 – 0
Wet	9	– 4	35 – 14 – 0
Garden	17	– 21	74 – 0 – 0
Cultivable waste			
Dry	23	– 7	12 – 8 – 0
Wet	8	– 14	7 – 0 – 0
Total	435	– 28	339 – 2 – 0

8 Finally confirmed on the existing gutta of Rs 186 – 0 – 0

13 – 5 – 89

(Signed) J. P. Grant
Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

Hosakote ——— Taluk ——— Bangalore ———

Assistant's opinion and recommendation.

13

Notice served on Mahadeva Row on 31st August 1878.

11-9-78 (Initialled) Robert Cole
Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

The party in column 5 has produced the document Rec^d 2 in column 7, which is returned to him.— Docket No 1 was received from the Division Commissioner's office. ——.

3 Confirmed on the existing Gutta, of Rs 186 Subject to all Local Fund and Irrigation cesses.

4 Rights to Sayer are conceded to all the 8 villages if any such item was realized in any of them, but are not now in the Holder's enjoyment and are therefore reserved. Rights to Abkari and Forests are reserved.

5 A valuation Survey is desired.

Hosakote
12th September 78 }

(Signed) Robert Cole
Superintendent of
Inam Settlements.

6 Revised as per the Dewan's Proceedings No. 4701-9/133 Dated 2nd September 1881. ———